

REMARKS

The drawings are rejected on formal grounds for not showing every feature of the invention.

The specification is objected to on the basis that it does not support the phrase "except for unintended frictional effects, exclusively," in claims 2 and 14. This objectionable language has been deleted, and new limitations have been proposed which make clear that one shock absorber is arranged to generate secure controlled damping during compression but not during expansion, while the other shock absorber is arranged to generate secure controlled damping during expansion but not during compression.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement as well as failing to comply with the written requirement.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 are allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections set out above.

Applicant points out that the drawing figures as originally filed disclose one example embodiment of a first shock absorber which damps during compression, and a separate, second shock absorber which damps during expansion.

The check valves described in the original disclosure, and shown for illustrative purposes as one embodiment in the original drawings, are designed and intended to stop the flow of fluid in the backwards-flow direction, and force all damping fluid to flow through the

respective damping valve of each of the respective shock absorbers. Shock absorber 100 is designed to receive all damping fluid through its damping valve and none through its closed check valve during compression, and the complementary shock absorber 200 is designed to receive all damping fluid through its damping valve and none through its closed check valve during expansion.

The Examiner points to elements in the drawings and concludes essentially that the check valves are not check valves. Applicant respectively disagrees with the Examiner's conclusions whereby she maintains that the presently disclosed and claimed check valves provide some desired and intended level of damping as disclosed in certain prior art references, which in those cases have specialized valves which are not intended to simply allow one directional flow, contrary to the present invention.

In one shock absorber, during compression when the piston side oil chamber is pressurized, all damping fluid in the piston side oil chamber goes through the compression side damping valve to generate a controlled secure compression side damping force. In the complementary other shock absorber, during expansion when the piston rod side oil chamber is pressurized, all damping fluid in the piston rod side oil chamber goes through the expansion side damping valve to generate a controlled secure expansion side damping force.

The called-out check valves close and direct the damping fluid through the compression damping valve in one shock absorber and through the expansion damping valve in the complementary shock absorber as clearly set out from the original disclosure.

CONCLUSION

Applicant asserts that all of the objections have been obviated, and now respectfully requests withdrawal of those objections and an allowance of this application.

PETITION FOR AN EXTENSION OF THE TERM

Applicant hereby petitions for a three-months extension of the term for reply from 16 July 2009 to 16 October 2009. Submitted herewith is a check for \$1110 to cover the cost of the extension. Any deficiency or overpayment should be charged or credited to Deposit Account Number 04-2219, referencing our Docket Number 13712.

Respectfully submitted,

/Keith H. Orum/

Keith H. Orum
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 33985

ORUM & ROTH LLC
53 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604-3606
TELEPHONE: 312.922.6262
FAX: 312.922.7747